

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

TONY LAMAR VANN,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	3:10-CV-1517-K
v.	§	
	§	
BRITISH PETROLEUM OIL CO.,	§	
ET AL.,	§	
Defendants.	§	

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and an order of the District Court, this case has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge. The findings, conclusions and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge follow:

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

On January 5, 2011, the Court sent Plaintiff a Magistrate Judge's Questionnaire seeking additional information regarding his claims. The order stated that failure to return the Questionnaire within thirty days could result in a recommendation that this case be dismissed. On February 2, 2011, Plaintiff filed objections to the Questionnaire and failed to answer the Questionnaire.


Discussion: Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. *Larson v. Scott*, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5th Cir. 1998). "This authority [under Rule 41(b)] flows from the court's inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases." *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th

Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash, R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962)). Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's Order to answer the Court's Questionnaire. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has approved of the use of questionnaires as a proper method to develop the factual basis of a *pro se* complaint. *Green v. Atkinson*, 623 F.3d 178, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2011) (citing *Eason v. Thaler*, 14 F.3d 8 (5th Cir. 1994)) (affirming use of questionnaire as proper means for court to develop factual basis of complaint); *Berry v. Brady*, 192 F.3d 504, 507 (5th Cir. 1999) (same). Accordingly, the complaint should be dismissed for want of prosecution pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

RECOMMENDATION:

The Court recommends that the complaint be dismissed for want of prosecution pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Signed this 14th day of February, 2011.



PAUL D. STICKNEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of this report and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).